PTO/SB/21 (02-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM *(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)*	Application Number	09/590,027
	Filing Date	June 7, 2000
	First Named Inventor	Steven R. KLEIMAN
	Art Unit	2176
	Examiner Name	Chau T. NGUYEN
Total Number of Pages in This Submission: 2	Attorney Docket Number	103.1037.01

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 18 2004
OFFICIAL

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

- [ ] Fee Transmittal Form w/ Duplicate
- [ ] Fee Attached
- [ ] Amendment/Reply
- [ ] After Final
- [ ] Affidavits/declaration(s)
- [ ] Extension of Time Request
- [ ] Express Abandonment Request
- [ ] Information Disclosure Statement
- [ ] Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
- [ ] Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application
- [ ] Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53

- [ ] Drawing(s)
- [ ] Licensing-related Papers
- [ ] Petition
- [ ] Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application
- [ ] Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address
- [ ] Terminal Disclaimer
- [ ] Request for Refund
- [ ] CD, Number of CD(s) _____

- [ ] After Allowance communication to Technology Center (TC)
- [ ] Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
- [ ] Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
- [ ] Proprietary Information
- [ ] Status Letter
- [x] Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify below):
Correction of typographical error in May 17, 2004, response

Remarks
Fax. No.: (703) 872-9306

This is an informal filing that corrects a typographical error in the response filed on May 17, 2004. (Last line of 3rd paragraph on page 10 should read "therein that teaches an address or location..." instead of "therein that teaches and address or location...")

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual name	Dane C. Butzer (Reg. No. 43,521) for The Swernofsky Law Group
Signature	*[signature]*
Date	May 18, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

| Typed or printed name | Dane C. Butzer | | |
| Signature | *[signature]* | Date | May 18, 2004 |

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

103.1037.01

The applied art is not seen by Applicant to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1, at least with respect to "plural data buffers of different sizes, at least some of said data buffers matched to sizes of data blocks to be transferred into or out of those data buffers" and with respect to "select[ing] one or more of said data buffers for a data transfer responsive to a size of data blocks for said data transfer."

Features somewhat akin to these were recited by the versions of claims 1, 4 and 12, among others. Therefore, amended claim 1 is discussed below in light of the rejections of those claims.

Claims 1 and 4 recited that an address or location for a data transfer is responsive to a size of said data. The Office Action cited Yamishita at col. 3, line 33, to col. 4, line 17; col. 6, lines 32 to 49; and col. 6, line 56, to col. 7, line 2, as teaching this feature. While the cited text does discuss the data transfer length and size of the data, Applicant sees nothing whatsoever therein that teaches an address or location being responsive to these measures.

Furthermore, as amended, claim 1 now recites "select[ing] one or more of said data buffers for a data transfer responsive to *a size of data blocks* for said data transfer" (emphasis added). Applicant submits that the cited portions of Yamashita clearly do not teach this feature.

Claim 12 recited a data transfer region having buffers matched to different sized data transfers. The Office Action cited Liberty at col. 5, line 58, to col. 6, line 38, and Yamashita at col. 3, line 33, to col. 4, line 17, and col. 6, line 32, to col. 7, line 2 as teaching this feature.

-10-